DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 063 591 CS 000 021

AUTHOR Dunkeld, Colin G.
TITLE The Portland Project: An In-Service Training Program in the Teaching of Reading.
INSTITUTION Oregon State Univ., Portland.; Portland Public Schools, Oreg.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE May 72
GRANT OEG-0-70-4043(725)
NOTE 85p.; Paper presented at Annual Convention of International Reading Assn. (17th, Detroit, May 10-13, 1972)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *College School Cooperation; Disadvantaged Schools; Disadvantaged Youth; Elementary Education; *Inservice Programs; *Inservice Teacher Education; Language Arts; Parent Participation; *Reading Instruction; Released Time; Teacher Aides
IDENTIFIERS *Portland Project

ABSTRACT

The Portland Project, an inservice training program in the teaching of reading for teachers, parents, principals, and teacher aides, was a federally-funded joint effort of Portland State University and the Portland, Oregon, Public Schools. It provided for one day of released time per week for teachers of grades one through four in four disadvantaged public schools. University classroom presentations, workshop activities, and independent assignments were combined with on-site school demonstrations and supervision. All participants attended a two-week training session during August 1970. Teachers subsequently made significant progress in achieving 51 of 68 knowledge objectives and in achieving 6 of 11 classroom performance objectives. Parents made significant gains in attaining 12 of 13 knowledge objectives, while aides made significant progress in realizing 4 of 4 such objectives. However, sample measures of reading, writing and oral language performances of the children whose teachers and auxiliary personnel participated in the project revealed no significant gains nor losses. (Appendices include sample forms and various questionnaires utilized during the project.) (Author/RD)

ED 063591

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THE PORTLAND PROJECT

An In-Service Training Program in the Teaching of Reading

Colin G. Dunkeld
Portland State University

presented at

Implementing Innovative Products and Practice
Pre Convention Institute
Seventeenth Annual Convention
International Reading Association
Detroit, Michigan
May 9th and 10th, 1972

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Office of Education
EPDA Project No. OEG-0-70-4043(725)

CS 000 021

THE PORTLAND PROJECT

William A. Jenkins	Director
Colin G. Dunkeld	Associate Director
Marian Zollinger	Supervisor
Margaret Jones	Supervisor
Jean Bolos	Supervisor
Richard McMenemy	Parents' Program
Richard Gilkey	Media Specialist
Gene Ashback	Principal
James Bow	Principal
Isaac White	Principal
Leigh Wilcox	Principal
Mark Green	Evaluation Specialist
Joan Goforth	Evaluation Specialist
Steven Nelson	Evaluation Specialist
Marilyn Tanke	Graduate Assistant
Sharon Darcy	Secretary

The Portland Project: First Year

TABLE OF CONTENTS

page

I. SUMMARY 1

II. THE CONTEXT OF THE PROGRAM 4

III. THE PROGRAM 6

A. Scope, Objectives and Assumptions 6

B. Personnel 9

C. Procedures 10

IV. EVALUATION 21

A. Objectives 21

B. Choosing Participants 23

C. Measuring Changes 24

D. Analysis of the Data.....27

E. Multiplier Effect.....53

F. Findings 54

V. RECOMMENDATIONS.....59

LIST OF REFERENCES 61

APPENDICES.....62

LIST OF TABLES

Table page

1. Student Turnover in Program Schools 5
2. Racial Composition of Program Schools..... 6
3. Racial Composition of Program Participants 6
4. Estimated Program Costs.....20
5. Evaluation Schedule.....26
6. Inter-Rater Reliability on Oral and Written Language Samples.....40
7. Measurements of Oral and Written Language: Grade One.....41
8. Measurements of Oral and Written Language: Grade Two.....42
9. Measurements of Oral and Written Language: Grade Three.....43
10. Measurements of Oral and Written Language: Grade Four.....44
11. Reading Achievement Test Results for Project and Comparison Schools.....46
12. Participants' Rating of Program Activities.....47
13. Raw Score Means of Teacher Attitude and Practices Survey...52

THE PORTLAND PROJECT: FIRST YEAR

I Summary

The Portland Project was an in-service training program in the teaching of reading. It was planned and conducted jointly by Portland State University and Portland Public Schools, funded by the U.S. Office of Education, and evaluated by the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory.

The rationale for the program was that:

1. An in-service program should provide sufficient time for participants to assimilate the information provided by the program, select, practice, and develop new skills, or improve existing skills. It should not be a burden added to already busy teachers, tacked on to the end of a full day.
2. An in-service program should be comprehensive in scope encompassing as many personnel concerned with teaching as possible. It is well established that principals need to be actively supportive of in-service programs (Aaron et al,1965). The value of teaching aides is also becoming recognized (Emmerling, 1966). It is becoming increasingly evident too that the active cooperation of parents exerts a considerable influence upon children's achievement (Smith, 1963 and 1968, Della Piana, 1968). Therefore, teachers, their teaching aides, principals, and parents should be included in the program.
3. An in-service program should provide information to meet teachers' immediate needs. Frequent references in professional literature to teachers' overdependence upon the philosophy and method of a single basal text (Austin et al, 1963 and Spache and Spache, 1970) suggest a lack of information and a lack of confidence on the

part of many teachers for the construction of sound, eclectic programs. Furthmore, none of the currently devised approaches demonstrates clear superiority over any other (Bond and Dykstra, 1967). Therefore, an in-service program should provide information about the different emphases, different goals, and successful components of many approaches.

4. An in-service program should provide for transfer and application of what is learned to the classroom. Therefore, on-site demonstration, supervision, and feedback should be an integral part of the program.

Participants in the program were the principals, the teachers of grades one through four, the teachers' aides, and a group of parent volunteers from four low-achieving, disadvantaged public elementary schools selected by the Portland Public Schools of the basis of need.

The objectives of the program were:

1. To increase teachers' knowledge of techniques and materials for the teaching of reading and language.
2. To train teachers to diagnose children's specific needs in reading and language and to construct and implement programs for their classrooms based upon those needs.
3. To train teachers' aides in the use of a variety of materials for the teaching of reading to enable them to increase their usefulness to the classroom teachers.
4. To train a group of parent volunteers in the use of a variety of materials for the teaching of reading to enable them to work with teachers in the classrooms and to assist their own children in learning to read at home.

The first year began with a two week summer session in August 1970 and continued throughout the 1970-71 school year. Aides and principals attended the summer session only. Teachers and parents attended both the summer and the year long programs. Throughout the year the teachers were released from their classrooms one day a week to attend classes and workshops at the university while paid, qualified, substitute teachers took their places in the classrooms.

The training activities consisted of lectures, workshop tasks, independent assignments, and regular supervision, demonstration, and assistance in classrooms. The teachers received a stipend for the summer session and earned 22 quarter hours of college credit for the summer and school year. The parents were paid $1.60 per hour up to a maximum of four hours per week.

Changes in knowledge and performance were assessed by means of locally constructed tests, questionnaires, and observational schedules. Teachers made significant gains in 51 out of 68 specific objectives concerning knowledge of techniques and materials in the teaching of reading and language. They made significant gains in 6 out of 11 specific objectives concerning their classroom performance. Parents made significant gains in 12 out of 13 specific knowledge objectives, and aides made significant gains in 4 out of 4 specific knowledge objectives. No direct measures of aides' or parents' classroom performances were taken. Teachers received an average of just over one hour's assistance from a parent per week at a cost of less than five minutes of teacher's time.

Parents and teachers perceived the program as a whole and the majority of the instructional and supervisory activities to have been of interest and

value. Sample measures of children's reading and their performances in oral and written language in project schools and comparison schools were taken at points in the program. They suggest neither significant gains nor losses and are insufficient to be used for an evaluation of program activities.

The combination of university lecture-discussion-workshop activities and on-site classroom demonstration and supervision was effective in increasing teachers' knowledge and in changing certain teaching practices. Children's achievements in reading and language tests were probably not significantly affected during the program. Implications for future in-service programs were noted. Long term effects on the development and maintenance of teaching skills and on reading achievement within the schools were not assessed.

II The Context of the Program

Portland is a city with a population of 380,000. It has 96 elementary schools and spent an estimated average of $750.05 per elementary school pupil in 1970-71. According to federal guidelines for assessing deprivation, the level of deprivation per school area averages 16%. The need for programs to improve the teaching of reading in low-achieving schools with an above average percentage of deprivation is well known. Portland Public Schools were therefore asked to identify four such schools in need of assistance with the teaching of reading.

Meetings were held in which an outline of the scope and purposes of the program was presented and discussed with the teachers and principals.

The four schools expressed a willingness to participate.

The level of deprivation in each of the four schools exceeds 20%. The schools are located in widely separate parts of the city and are in transient neighborhoods experiencing a steady turnover of pupils each year. The extent of the turnover is shown in Table 1.

Table 1

Student Turnover in Program Schools

	Begin	In	Out	End
School 1				
1969-70	489	699 (210)	222	477
1970-71	462	580 (118)	173	407
School 2				
1969-70	297	400 (103)	129	271
1970-71	279	355 (76)	106	249
School 3				
1969-70	680	869 (189)	179	691
1970-71	592	801 (209)	170	631
School 4				
1969-70	655	764 (109)	135	629
1970-71	664	805 (141)	139	666

Begin = enrollment at beginning of year, September 30.

In = beginning enrollment plus students transferring in.

Out = students transferring out.

End = enrollment at end of year, June

Three of the schools are predominantly white; one is predominantly black. In one of the white schools, 23% of the children are black; in another 11% are oriental. Details are presented in Table 2.

Table 2

Racial Composition of Program Schools

	White	Black	Oriental	Spanish American	American Indian
School 1	82.1%	3.4%	11.1%	2.3%	1.1%
School 2	72.2%	22.9%	0.8%	1.6%	2.5%
School 3	41.4%	58.4%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%
School 4	94.5%	0.9%	0.9%	3.2%	0.5%

III The Program

A. Scope, Objectives and Assumptions

The program was limited to persons conerned with the teaching of reading in grades one through four of the four elementary schools. It included the 4 principals, 36 teachers, 19 teachers' aides, and 21 parents. The racial composition of the program participants is shown in Table 3.

Table 3

Racial Composition of Program Participants

	Total	White	Black	Oriental
Principals	4	3	1	0
Teachers	36	33	2	1
Teachers' Aides	18	14	4	0
Parents	21	20	1	0

Three teachers possessed masters degrees. The teachers had taken a mean of 2.2 methods courses in the teaching of reading and language within the past ten years and a mean of 2.0 methods courses more than ten years prior to the program. Within the past ten years three teachers had taken four or more methods courses, nine had taken one course, and four had taken no courses. One teacher was in her first year of teaching, six were in their second year, and eight had taught for more than twenty years. The teachers had a mean of 9.8 years of teaching experience. Eleven teachers failed to meet regular graduate admissions requirements and were granted special status to participate and recieve credit in the program.

Educational qualifications of the aides ranged from fourteen who had high school diplomas but had less than two years of college to three who held bachelor's degrees. Their experience ranged from one who was in her first year to one who was in her fifteenth. Excluding the most experienced, who was atypical, the median experience for the group was 1.8 years as a teacher's aide.

Of the twenty-one parents, two did not have high school diplomas, thirteen had attended college at some time but for less than two years, and one had a bachelor's degree. None had worked as aides or had given any kind of instructional assistance in a school.

The objectives of the program were:

1. To increase teacher's knowledge of techniques and materials for teaching reading.
2. To train teachers to diagnose children's specific needs in reading and language, and to construct and implement programs

for their classrooms based upon those needs.

3. To train teacher's aides in the use of a variety of materials for the teaching of reading to enable them to increase their usefulness to the classroom teachers.
4. To train a group of parent volunteers to work with teachers in the classrooms and to assist their own children in learning to read at home.

The general objectives in turn were analyzed and rewritten as numerous specific behavioral, performance, and process objectives. Topics for which specific objectives were written are listed in the section reporting the evaluation of program activities. (pp. 27-30).

The program had certain biases and operated on certain assumptions regarding training and supervision. The biases were that a successful reading program -

1. Maintains a very close relationship between a child's own spoken language and the materials used for the teaching of reading.
2. Depends upon children's development in all of the language arts, especially listening and speaking.
3. Fully recognizes individual rates and patterns of development in all of the language subskills.

Training was conceived of as more than the training in the construction of activities or training in the appropriate use of certain teaching materials. It was viewed as a process by which a teacher gains independence -

1. In assessing children's stages of development in all aspects of language.
2. In designing, presenting, and organizing activities to match those stages.

The assumptions were that -

1. A program of instruction would increase teachers' knowledge of techniques and materials.
2. A program of classroom demonstration and supervision would assist teachers in organizing their classrooms and applying their increased knowledge.
3. A training program for teachers' aides and parents would assist the teachers in their task of teaching children to read.

B. Personnel

The staff was drawn jointly from the university and the public schools. A reading specialist was added to the university staff as associate director of the program. The duties of staff members and the percentage of their time devoted to the program were as follows:

Director:	Write proposal and program guidelines, establish policy, obtain staff, contract for evaluation, compile budget, instruct and supervise.	20% (U)
Associate Director:	Instruct, coordinate instructional and evaluational activities, supervise, handle day to day administration.	67% (U)
3 Supervisors:	Supervise, demonstrate, assist program participants individually, instruct, conduct workshop activities.	100% (U)
		100% (S)
		50% (U)

Instructor for Parents' Program:	Instruct, direct the parents' activities.	25% (S)
Media-Specialist:	Instruct, conduct workshop activities, obtain specialized materials.	25% (S)
Administrative Assistant:	Clerical	100% (U)
Secretary:	Communications and records	50% (U)
2 Graduate Assistants:	Assist program staff, carry out directed evaluation activities.	33% (U)
		33% (U)

(U) = indicates university personnel. (S) = indicates public schools personnel.

In addition, an evaluation team was employed under a separate contract.

The instructor for the parents' program was a reading specialist in the public schools. One of the three supervisors had formerly been supervisor of language arts instruction in the public schools; the other two had been primary grade teachers and language arts consultants.

C. Procedures

1. Organizational Details

The period of time covered by this report is the summer of 1970 and the 1970-71 school year; this is the first year of a two-year program. Instruction and workshop activities took place at Portland State University. On-site demonstration and supervision took place in the schools.

a. Planning and Provision for Review

Many opportunities were provided for joint planning and review of the effectiveness of program procedures. Before the program began all staff members, teachers, and principals were asked to contribute suggestions and make known their requests for program content. One principal, two teachers and four staff members submitted suggestions. These suggestions were circulated amongst the program participants and staff members for comments. Following this, the staff met to plan instructional and workshop activities.

A teachers' feedback committee was formed to meet as it desired and make known its suggestions for program content and procedures. Supervisors drew upon their experiences in the classrooms and asked teachers directly to make requests for program content. A member of the evaluation team regularly monitored sample training activities and provided immediate written feedback to the program staff. Pre-tests of all lecture-discussion topics were given at the beginning of each quarter and used diagnostically to increase the relevance of training activities. Additionally, an ad hoc meeting of the program staff was called early in the school year at the request of the school principals.

In practice, though many opportunities for participation in program planning were made available, and though each had some effect, by far the bulk of the program planning was done by instructional staff members. The program participants made only minor suggestions from time to time regarding content and procedures.

b. In-Service Training for Staff

A short in-service training program was conducted for members of the supervisory staff by a specialist in supervision. Five two-hour sessions were held in which supervisory techniques were presented, practiced, and discussed, and a supervision model examined. The model consisted of an observer in the classroom providing feedback and discussion to increase teachers' awareness of their performances, and of alternatives. In addition, members of the program staff attended the International Reading Association Annual Meeting and the National Council of Teachers of English Conference on Language Arts in the Elementary Schools to make comparisons and obtain suggestions from similar programs. The director and assistant director attended joint planning session discussions, and progress reports, from four sister EPDA programs.

2. Program Activities

a. Teachers

i. Introduction

Each quarter the program activities were developed around a central theme. The themes were:

Summer: Basic Techniques in Teaching Reading

Fall: Language Activities and the Teaching of Reading

Winter: Diagnostic Teaching of Reading

Spring: Children's Literature and the Teaching of Reading

During each quarter the teachers were provided with lists of behavioral objectives concerning items of teacher knowledge.

Decisions were made not to present lists of behavioral objectives concerning classroom performance because specific performances of a teacher should be evaluated against that teacher's classroom organizational plan, and against that teacher's prior performance. Goals for teacher's performances were set individually by program supervisors. It was not expected that all teachers would employ identical observable techniques.

The training activities were of four kinds:

1. Lecture-discussion sessions
2. Training tasks carried out at the workshop sessions
3. Specific independent assignments in the teachers' own time
4. On-site classroom supervision, demonstration, and assistance

A typical day's schedule for the teachers during each of the ten days of the summer session and each of the released time days once each week throughout the year consisted of a 90-minute lecture-discussion session followed by a 90 minute workshop each morning and a 90 minute media workshop followed by individual conferences and independent study each afternoon.

The school principals occupied the dual role of program participants and staff discussion leaders in the summer program.

ii. The Lecture Discussions

The lecture discussions consisted of presentations by members of the program staff or guest lecturers on topics related to the major theme. For example, a series of lectures examined and evaluated different systems for teaching word-recognition. Another topic was the construction and use of experience charts and the integration of language-experience techniques with graded basal reading programs. Another topic was the reading aloud or telling of children's stories by the teacher.

Lecture-discussions were supplemented by the use of overhead transparencies and chalkboard examples and summaries.

iii. Workshop Activities

Workshop activities consisted of guided participation in specific tasks, for example the practice writing and discussion of the uses and limitations of behavioral objectives, the construction of audio tapes for language teaching, participation in creative dramatics and choral reading activities, practice administration and interpretation of diagnostic reading tests, and the preparation of questioning strategies for specific stories. A complete listing of lecture-discussion topics, workshop training tasks, and specific independent assignments is given in Appendix A.

iv. Supervision

Supervision was carried out by all members of the project staff, primarily by one half-time and two full-time staff members who were in the schools daily. They demonstrated new materials with whole classes and small groups of children, assisted with lesson preparation, worked with children with special needs, discussed and planned solutions to classroom management problems, obtained materials for teachers, made suggestions for independent activities, and assisted teachers in analyzing aspects of their performance and planning alternative teaching strategies.

The full time supervisors expressed their discomfort with the passivity of a purely observational-feedback-discussion role. Their point of view was that they could influence teacher behavior more successfully and more permanently by being willing to teach beside the teachers and participate actively in the events of the class and the school.

They considered it essential that supervisors were perceived as valuable sources of help and not as unwelcome, critical intruders. Supervisors arrived early in the morning and stayed late in order to meet informally with teachers and plan convenient times to visit classrooms and assist teachers. By participating in classrooms, they experienced directly the problems teachers faced. Planning

between teachers and supervisors became joint efforts with common purposes in mind. One member of the project staff maintained an observational-feedback-discussion role, but was able to make little more than one visit to each room in that role throughout the year.

v. Equipment and Materials

Textbooks were purchased and placed on reserve in the university reference library for teachers to use. Program staff prepared mimeographed supplements to accompany key lectures. Staff and participants collaborated in the production of booklets on "Independent Activities and Games to Teach Reading", and "Ways of Sharing Children's Books". Diagnostic reading tests, auditory discrimination tests, and readiness tests, were purchased for training activities. Sets of published instructional materials, texts, and sample collections of children's books were purchased for the use of supervisory staff in classrooms and to introduce program participants to materials and methods unfamiliar to them. The media specialist regularly obtained and made available to program schools new texts and audio-visual materials for the teaching of reading and the language arts.

b. Teacher's Aides

The entire program for the teachers' aides was confined to the mornings of the ten-day summer session. Aides attended all of the general lecture-discussion sessions and participated in a workshop program of their own under the direction of one staff

member. Aides at all times were addressed as teachers. The program invited aides to display initiative in the classroom in discussing and planning learning activities with teachers.

Workshop activities consisted of discussions of aide-pupil and aide-teacher relationships, informal case studies of problem situations, and specific activities for teaching reading to individuals and small groups of children. Sample topics were: Listening to a Child Read, Reading Aloud to Children, Constructing and Using an Experience Chart, and Helping Children to Complete a Workbook Exercise. The aides produced a booklet, "Here's an Idea", a compilation of activities for teaching reading and language.

c. The Parents' Program

The parents attended all of the general lecture-discussion sessions with the teachers throughout the ten-day summer session and throughout most of the year. In addition they attended a special 90 minute workshop session of their own, conducted by the director of the parents' program. They gave voluntary assistance in classrooms throughout the year.

The workshop sessions consisted of a careful examination of materials for the teaching of reading and question and answer sessions about the use of those materials with individuals and small groups of children. General principles of counselling and of

tutoring were discussed. Group and individual visits were made to a school library and to public libraries. Specific suggestions were presented and discussed for parents to help their children learn to read at home.

d. Budget

The program was funded by the U.S. Office of Education. The total budget amounted to $188,000.

Broad budget categories were as follows: Staff Salaries - $89,600., Evaluation Sub-contract - $14,100., Various Stipends and Program Support Costs, including the costs of providing substitute teachers - $69,500., Materials and Supplies - $6,700., Travel costs - $8,100.

Applying programmed budgeting techniques, the costs break down into the following categories: Parents' Summer Program - $3,100., Teachers' Summer Program - $22,200., Year-long Parents' Program - $12,800., Year-long Teachers' Program - $149,900. Within the teachers' program, cost breakdowns were: Administration - $26,300., Instruction - $38,000., Supervision - $24,500., Evaluation - $18,600., and Program Support Costs - $42,500.

The cost of the program per participant was: Summer Program - cost per parent, $281.; cost per teacher, $616. Year-long program - cost per parent, $674.; cost per teacher, $4,164.

No cost figures appear for the aides' program. The aides were paid by the school district and the aides' program was run in

conjunction with the summer program for teachers with no extra staff assignments being required.

A summary of major budget categories translated into estimated program costs is presented in Table 4.

Table 4

Estimated Program Costs

udgeted Categories		Estimated Program Costs							
		Summer Program		Year-Long Program					
				Parents	Teachers				
tem	Cost	Parents	Teachers		Admin.	Instruct.	Superv.	Eval.	Support
laries									
Admin., instr. Superv.	66,600.								
clerical	8,700.								
consultant	2,500.	1,000.	9.700.	5,000	14,800	23,200	18,000	6,100	-
%benefits	11,800	200.	1,700	900	1,900	3,500	2.700	900	-
TOTAL	89,600.	1,200	11,400.	5,900.	16,700	26,700	20,700	7,000	-
aluation ontract	14,100	200	1,800	500	-	-	-	11,600	-
ious tipends									
Parents	6,000	1,000	-	5,000	-	-	-	-	-
Teachers	6,300	-	6,300	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substitute teachers	40,100	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	40,100
Required fees	3,100	-	700	-	-	-	-	-	2,400
Admin. Overhead	14,000	600	1,400	1,000	2,800	5,000	3,200	-	-
TOTAL	69,500	1,600	8,400	6,000	2,800	5,000	3,200	-	42,500
terials									
nstruct.	3,400	-	400	200	-	2,800	-	-	-
Admin.	3,300	100	200	200	2,800	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	6,700	100	600	400	2,800	2,800	-	-	-
avel	8,100	-	-	-	4,000	3,500	600	-	-
L	188,000.	3,100	22,200	12,800	26,300	38,000	24,500	18,600	42,500

				$149,900	
of Program Participants	11	36	19	36	
rage Cost Per Participant	$281.	$616.	$674.	$4,164.	

IV Evaluation

A. Objectives

1. Overall Objectives

It must be borne in mind that the Portland Project was not conceived as a research project. It was a training program with a clear-cut responsibility for evaluating its effectiveness in terms of its goals but not subject to the constraints and rigorous control of the variables associated with a research project. To have attempted to do so would have limited the scope and flexibility and distorted the reality of the training activities, or would have required an inappropriately large proportion of effort and resources being channelled into measurement. Accordingly, the following plan for evaluation was designed.

Four kinds of evaluation were anticipated:

a. Gains in knowledge by teachers, teachers' aides, and parents.

b. Changes in selected items of teachers' classroom performance.

c. Long term, though not necessarily short term, gains in children's achievement in reading and language.

d. Participant's perceptions of the value of various program activities.

2. Objectives Evaluated

a. Knowledge. Evaluations were made of 68 specific objectives of teachers' knowledge, 4 specific objectives of aide's knowledge, and 15 specific objectives of parents' knowledge.

Evaluations were made by means of pre and post paper and pencil tests administered each quarter. In addition, selected items from the teachers' tests were pre and post tested with a group of teachers from two comparison schools.

b. Performance. Evaluations were made of 11 specific objectives of teachers' classroom performance by means of pre and post observations and interview schedules administered to teachers in the project schools and the comparison schools. Additionally, evaluations were made of 13 workshop tasks and independent training assignments given to teachers in the project schools. Information was also collected from teachers periodically about three kinds of assistance received from parents.

c. Children's achievement. The aim and justification of any in-service program is the eventual gain in children's achievements and attitudes in the classroom. The program staff were therefore interested in this facet of evaluation but expressed many reservations about possible interpretation that might be put upon the data. In the first place, many variables were undoubtedly operating that were not under the control of the program, notably, for example a recent change in basal readers and changes in the organization of the reading program within project schools. Secondly, a Hawthorne effect, while desireable if it occurred, would certainly mask the effects of specific program activities.

Thirdly, the transient nature of the school populations again complicated the collection and interpretation of data. And fourthly, the replacement of teachers by substitute teachers might be hypothesized to offset any anticipated gains resulting from improved teaching if the training activities proved to be effective.

In view of the limited interpretation possible without the employment of a complex evaluation design, plans were made to collect only two kinds of data about children's achievement in reading and language. Plans were made to draw upon data from the regular testing program of the public schools in order to make comparisons between past and current achievement in project schools, and between project schools and two approximately similar comparison schools. Additionally, plans were made to collect pre and post samples of oral and written language from a small random sample of children in project and comparison schools.

d. Participants' perceptions of the value of various program activities were assessed by means of questionnaires administered periodically during the program and after the completion of the first year.

B. Choosing Participants

The program participants were the principals, teachers of grades one through four, the teachers' aides, and a group of parent volunteers from four low-achieving disadvantaged city

elementary schools identified by the public schools for participation in the program.

Two other schools in somewhat similar disadvantaged areas, but not schools deemed to be in need of assistance with their reading programs, were selected by Portland Public Schools for certain selected comparisons to be made. The principal of one of those schools stated that the teaching of reading had been given the highest priority in his school for several years, that a reading coordinator was employed to this end, and that all teachers regarded themselves as reading teachers.

Of the 36 teachers who completed the program, 35 were present from the beginning, 1 took the place of another who was transferred between the summer and full sessions. No other teachers withdrew.

21 parents participated in the program. Eleven began at the commencement of the program, 10 others joined the program at different times during its first three months. Two withdrew during the year. One aide withdrew during the summer session.

C. Measuring Changes

The objectives concerning changes in the teachers', parents', and aides' knowledge were assessed by means of paper and pencil tests. Changes in teachers' classroom performances were assessed by observational and interview schedules used by trained observers. Teachers' performances on specific independent assignments and workshop tasks were evaluated by examining written

reports and written answers to test situations. Parents' performances were assessed by means of critical incidents and sample logs of parent activities submitted by teachers. In all cases performance criteria were specified by program staff. Data collection and analysis were carried out by trained members of the evaluation team. Children's reading achievement in the spring of their third grade year was assessed by the McMenemy Silent Reading Test, the only reading test administered routinely in grades one through four throughout Portland Public Schools. Children's oral and written language development was assessed by obtaining oral and written language samples in response to picture stimulae and by analyzing the samples for number of words, number of communication units, number of mazes, number of subordinate constructions, average length of communication units, average number of words in mazes, and average number of words in subordinate constructions.

A pre and post teacher attitude and practices survey questionnaire was administered by members of the project staff and scored and interpreted by the Learning Institute of North Carolina, the agency responsible for the coordinated evaluation of five sister EPDA programs.

The evaluation schedule is summarized in Table 5. Sample observation schedules are presented in Appendix B.

Table 5

Evaluation Schedule

Objective Evaluated	Instrument Used	Pre-Test	Post-Test
1. Knowledge			
a. Teacher's Knowledge	Paper and Pencil Test	Beginning of each quarter	End of each quarter
b. Aide's Knowledge	Paper and Pencil Test	Beginning of Summer Session	End of Summer Session
c. Parent's Knowledge	Paper and Pencil Test	Beginning of each quarter	End of each quarter
2. Performance			
a. Teacher's Classroom Performance	Observation Schedule and Interview	December,1970	April, 1971
b. Teacher's Independent Assignments	List of Criteria for Each Task	None	3 in Summer 2 in Fall 3 in Winter 5 in Spring
c. Parent's Performances	Sample Logs Kept by Teachers	None	December,1970 February - April, 1971
3. Children's Achievements	a. McMenemy Silent Reading Test	None	Spring, 1970
	b. Samples of Oral and Written Language	December,1970	May, 1971
4. Participants' Perceptions of Program Activities			
a. Parents' and Teachers' Evaluation of the Program	a. Teachers' Questionnaire	None	August, 1970 January, 1971 September, 1971
	b. Parents' Questionnaire	None	September, 1971
b. Teachers' Attitudes and Practices	Questionnaire	October, 1970	May, 1971

D. Analysis of the Data

1. Knowledge

a. Teachers' Knowledge

The following summaries are based upon The Final Report Evaluation prepared by the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, Portland, Oregon, June 11, 1971.

In general, the performance criteria set by the program staff for knowledge and performance items were arbitrarily high. Though performance criteria were frequently not met, significant changes ($p > .05$, one-tailed) were recorded in 51 out of 68 knowledge items and 6 out of 11 specific performance items.

Topics in which teachers' knowledge improved significantly were:

1. The sequence and elements of a conventional reading lesson. (S)
2. The distinguishing characteristics of basal reader, phonic, linguistic, and language experience approaches to the teaching of reading. (N)
3. The effectiveness of various methods for teaching word-recognition.
4. Useful phonic generalizations.
5. Definitions of phonic and linguistic terms. (S)
6. Definitions of terms describing spoken language.
7. A syllabus for teaching speaking in an elementary school.
8. Factors which interfere with listening.
9. Ways of using a tape recorder for oral reading.
10. Stories for reading aloud.
11. Relationships between silent and oral reading.

12. Difficulties encountered in teaching choral speaking.
13. Steps in the preparation of passages for choral speaking. (S)
14. Methods of casting in choral speaking.
15. Criteria for selecting a story for creative dramatics.
16. Defining characteristics of creative dramatics.
17. Materials for stimulating creative writing.
18. Sustaining independent writing.
19. Purposes and sample activities of three kinds of writing lessons. (S)
20. Activities in the early stages of written composition.
21. Sources of words for teaching spelling. (N)
22. Poetry books for the elementary school.
23. Technical terms in poetry. (N)
24. A system for teaching standard English to children speaking non-standard English.
25. Terms for the measurement of units of language. (S)
26. Ways to increase the objectivity of evaluation of written composition.
27. Specific purposes of readiness activities. (S)
28. Classifying questions according to thinking activities. (S)
29. Constructing questions to match thinking abilities.
30. Anticipated ranges of reading achievement.
31. Criticisms of grouping practices for reading instruction.
32. Ways of improving grouping practices. (S)
33. Prescribing instruction for specific word-recognition difficulties. (N)

34. Identifying subskills of reading comprehension. (S)
35. Prescribing instruction in comprehension difficulties.
36. Materials for teaching reading comprehension. (S)
37. Readability formulas.
38. Factors which influence the difficulty of a reading passage.
39. Cloze procedure for assessing passage difficulty.
40. Selecting reading passages to match children's levels of development.
41. Interpreting an informal reading inventory. (S)
42. Computing a reading expectancy.
43. Guidelines for establishing a classroom library.
44. Classroom library management practices.
45. Sustaining interest in literature.
46. Children's preferences in literature.
47. Children's responses to specific stories.
48. Ways of sharing independent reading experiences.
49. Reasons for sharing independent reading experiences.
50. Constructing a weekly schedule according to specifications.
51. Units of spoken language.

Topics in which teachers' knowledge did not improve significantly were:

1. Generalizations governing syllable division.
2. Preparing a passage for reading comprehension.
* 3. The purposes and steps in constructing an experience chart.
4. Reasons for teaching speaking.
5. Characteristics of a teacher which encourage children to speak.

6. Activities which promote good listening habits.
7. Activities for oral reading.
8. Recommended time proportions for oral reading.
9. Guidelines for oral reading.
10. Criteria for choosing a selection for choral speaking.
11. A sequence of activities for creative dramatics.
12. Requirements for a classroom writing center.
* 13. Increasing children's interest in poems.
14. Characteristics of reading readiness.
15. Ways of assessing readiness for reading. (N)
16. Identifying and classifying children's word recognition difficulties.
* 17. Categories of books for a classroom library.

* indicates topics in which a high performance on the pretest left little opportunity or necessity for gains to be made. The pre tests otherwise indicated that at the beginning of each quarter, before topics were presented and discussed, teachers as a group did not respond well to questions which were primarily directed towards their understanding of day to day basic teaching competencies.

(S) and (N) indicate those topics in which the performances of teachers in project schools and comparison schools were compared. (S) indicates topics in which scores earned by teachers in project schools were significantly ($p > .05$) higher than scores earned by teachers in comparison schools. (N) indicates topics in which scores earned by teachers in project schools did not differ significantly from scores earned by teachers in comparison schools.

An examination of the topics in which gains were made and a consideration of the training activities used shows the following:

1. Teachers made significant gains in 29 topics out of a total of 42 developed by lecture discussion alone.
2. Teachers made significant gains in 8 topics out of a total of 10 developed by lecture discussion supplemented by workshop activities.
3. Teachers made significant gains in 6 topics out of a total of 6 developed by lecture discussion supplemented by workshop practice and an independent assignment.
4. Teachers made significant gains in 5 topics out of 5 developed by lecture discussion supplemented by specific independent assignments.
5. Teachers made significant gains in 3 topics out of a total of 4 developed by specific independent assignments alone.
6. Teachers did not make significant gains in one topic inadvertently omitted from program activities.

Several factors should be borne in mind:

1. Specific independent assignments and workshop tasks were made directly relevant to classroom teaching, e.g., prepare questions for use with a story you are using, administer a Wepman Auditory Discrimination Test to a child whose auditory discrimination is in question, etc.
2. Lecture-discussions were presented with full use of audio-visual aids, chalkboard, and mimeographed supplementary materials.
3. Written lists of behavioral objectives were presented to the teachers.

4. Supervisors were available to assist teachers with all of the activities of the program.

Under these conditions significant gains took place in 51 out of 68 items of knowledge. Lecture-discussion alone, although effective, was the least effective method. Lecture-discussion supplemented by a specific independent assignment was the most effective.

Pre and post tests of seventeen of the tests of teacher knowledge were administered to teachers in the comparison schools. Pre test differences were not significant. On all seventeen tests, teachers in project schools earned higher post-test scores than teachers in comparison schools. In five of those tests the scores were not statistically significant. In the other twelve tests the scores were significantly different ($p > .05$).

b. Aides' Knowledge

Aides made significant gains in all four items of knowledge that were assessed. The four items were:

1. Specific tasks in which an aide can assist a teacher.
2. Knowledge of the use of specific instructional materials for reading and language.
3. Tutoring techniques for use with an individual child.
4. Acceptable ways of working with an uncooperative child.

c. Parents' Knowledge

Parents made significant gains in 12 out of 13 specific items of knowledge of the teaching of reading and language.

These items were:

1. Ways in which a parent can help a teacher.
2. Ways of increasing parents' participation in reading with their own children.
3. Knowledge of basic terms of reading instruction.
4. Knowledge of basic terms of remedial reading instruction.
5. Recognition of true and false statements about reading instruction.
6. Methods of remediation.
7. Materials for teaching reading available in Portland Public Schools.
8. Methods and materials for beginning readers.
9. Principles of motivation.
10. Specific remedial practices for deficiencies in consonant sounds, short vowel sounds, long vowel sounds, word patterns and blending of letters.
11. Use of the library.
12. Ways of increasing children's interest in books.

The one item in which they did not show a significant improvement was: Ways of increasing a child's vocabulary, background, and experiences with or without a library.

2. Performance
   a. Teachers' Classroom Performance

   According to observational and interview schedules obtained during visits to classrooms by trained observers, teachers made significant gains ($p > .05$) in 6 out of 11 aspects of teaching performances observed.

Those in which gains were noted were:

1. Planning a week's work in reading and language using a variety of appropriate materials and classroom organizational patterns.
2. Holding individual conferences with students about reading. (N)
3. Obtaining and making use of students' suggestions for the content and scheduling of reading and language activities. (S)
4. Making specific suggestions for students' independent work. (N)
5. Making use of a systematic plan when teaching reading to small groups. (S)
6. Establishing classroom libraries, following suggestions for improving their appearance, and implementing practices encouraging their use.

Those in which significant gains ($p > .05$) were not noted were:

1. Obtaining information about children's progress by standardized and informal tests. (N)
* 2. Selecting materials for instructional use and for independent study according to level of difficulty, interest to the child, and literary content. (N)
3. Guidance of students in the choice of independent activities. (N)
* 4. Using a variety of questions in discussing a reading selection. (N)
5. Using a purposeful sequence of questions in discussing a reading activity.

* indicates that performances in the pre-observations were high leaving little opportunity or necessity for gain.

(S) and (N) indicate performances in which comparisons were made

between teachers in project schools and teachers in comparison schools.

(S) indicates that significant difference between teachers in project schools and teachers in comparison schools were noted in favor of teachers in project schools.

(N) indicates differences between teachers in project schools and teachers in comparison schools were not significant.

b. Teachers' Specific Assignments

More than 80% of the teachers carried out the following specific independent assignments satisfactorily according to predetermined criteria for each.

1. A comparison of materials representing two contrasting approaches to the teaching of reading.
2. A description and critique of the word-recognition program of the basal reading materials selected for use at the teacher's grade level.
3. A schedule for the reading and language arts activities for the first week.
4. A log and critique of independent reading about the teaching of reading and language.
5. Objectives for a sequence of language activities. Design, implementation, and modification of those activities.
6. Computation of reading expectancies for two children.
7. Location of materials for independent use by students designed to teach a specific reading skill.
8. Construction of questions about reading passages for use with a class to accomplish appropriately stated objectives.

9. Computation of the readability of two selected children's library books.
10. Establishment of a classroom library according to program guidelines and management practices.
11. Collection of information by means of an informal reading inventory technique concerning children's word recognition and comprehension in books chosen for independent reading.
12. Preparation of stories from chidren's literature for reading aloud.

Additionally, all of the teachers administered and interpreted each of the following tests:

1. Wepman Auditory Discrimination Test
2. Durrell Learning Rate Test
3. Harris or Mills Learning Methods Test
4. Two Informal Reading Inventories
5. Dolch or Fry List of Basic Words
6. Roswell-Chall Diagnostic Reading Test

Six weeks after administering and interpreting the above tests, teachers were given a paper and pencil test on the purposes of the tests.

Twenty teachers were able to state the purposes of each test satisfactorily, 11 teachers expressed only a partial understanding of the purposes of the tests, and 5 teachers were either incorrect or expressed almost no understanding of the purposes of the tests.

c. Parents' Performance

An analysis of sample logs of parents' activities prepared by teachers shows that parents provided five categories of assistance to teachers.

Those categories were:

I. Total Class Instruction

e.g. Reading Stories

Assisting in the direction of a class play

Assisting on field trips

II. Individual and Small Group Instruction

e.g. Assisting children with assigned work

Hearing children read

III. Preparation for class

e.g. Preparation of Art materials

Preparation of tests materials

IV. Post Instructional Aid

e.g. Test correction

Bulletin Board display

V. Non-instructional Aid

e.g. Help with class party

While individual teachers made different use of parents' services, 74% of parents' time was spent in instructional assistance, categories I and II, and 26% of parents' time was spent in support services, categories III, IV and V.

In a typical week, teachers reported that they invested an average of 4.4 minutes of time in explaining to parents what needed to be done, in return for which they received an average of 73 minutes of assistance.

3. Children's Achievements

Samples of oral and written language were obtained from a random sample of children at each grade level of grades one through four of the four project schools and the two comparison schools. Graduate assistants were trained to elicit and to analyze the language samples according to specified procedures, substantially those described by Loban (1963). Large colored pictures showing children in action in a variety of familiar daily life activities were presented as stimulae. Two pictures were selected for use at each grade level. Pre tests were given in December and post tests were given in May. Picture A was used for the pre test with half of the sample, and picture B was used as the pre test for the other half. Children were then given the opposite pictures for the post test. Specific questions, instructions, and a controlled number of prompts and time intervals were used.

Oral language samples were tape-recorded and transcribed for later analysis. Analysis was made of the following items: Oral sample: Total number of words, number of communication units, number of mazes, total number of words in communication units, total number of words in mazes, number of subordinate constructions, average length of communication units.

Written sample: Total number of words, total number of communication units, average length of communication units, number of subordinate constructions.

The following information is taken from the report on oral and written language prepared by the Northwest Regional Laboratory, October, 1971.

Each examiner, after training, analyzed three test sample transcripts of oral and written language. An estimate of inter-rater reliability was computed for each of the eleven sub-tasks by means of Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance, W, (Edwards, 1962 pp. 252-255).

Coefficients of Concordance, W's, were significant ($p > .05$) for six of the eleven sub-tasks. Results are reported in Table 6.

Table 6

Inter-Rater Reliability on Oral and Written Language Samples

(Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance for 4 Judges' Ratings Over 11 Tasks (N=3))

Task	Kendall's W_c	F (df=2,5)
1. Total Number of Words	.98	147.00 *
2. Number of Communication Units	.59	4.32
3. Number of Mazes	.65	5.57
4. Total Number of Words in Communication Units	.42	2.17
5. Total Number of Words in Mazes	.79	11.29*
6. Number of Subordinate Constructions	.04	.13
7. Average Length of Communication Units	.87	20.08
8. Total Number of Words	.98	147.00*
9. Number of Communication Units	.87	20.08*
10. Average Length of Communication Units	.42	147.00*
11. Number of Subordinate Constructions	.73	20.08*
		8.11*

*significant, p.> .05.

The results of the oral and written language measures at each grade level are presented in tables 7 through 10.

Table 7

Measurements of Oral and Written Language: Grade One

		Project Schools		Comparison Schools	
		Pre test	Post test	Pre test	Post test
	Oral Sample				
1.	Total number of words	48.11	40.94	27.60	64.93
2.	Number of C-Units	4.72	4.50	3.20	6.64
3.	Number of Mazes	1.83	.94	1.29	1.80
4.	Total number of words in C-Units	43.39	38.22	24.64	53.79
5.	Total number of words in mazes	4.27	2.20	3.71	6.36
6.	Number of subordinate constructions	.17	.22	.20	.73
7.	Average length of C-Units	8.38	7.79	7.40	7.54
	Written Sample				
1.	Total number of words	7.84	9.28	8.67	12.00
2.	Number of C-units	.27	.81	.33	1.20
3.	Average length of C-units	.68	2.40	2.47	3.40
4.	Number of subordinate constructions	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Table 8

Measurements of Oral and Written Language: Grade Two

Oral Sample

	Project Schools		Comparison Schools	
	Pre Test	Post Test	Pre Test	Post Test
1. Total number of words	66.65	81.29	33.00	52.50
2. Number of C-units	6.77	7.58	3.63	6.38
3. Number of mazes	2.71	3.88	.63	2.50
4. Number of words in C-units	60.65	69.35	30.63	46.50
5. Number of words in mazes	5.82	11.94	2.38	6.25
6. Number of Subordinate constructions	.29	1.18	0.00	0.00
7. Average length of C-units	8.76	9.21	7.35	7.30

Written Sample

1. Total number of words	13.89	20.73	12.33	24.50
2. Number of C-units	1.56	2.06	.75	3.00
3. Average length of C-Units	4.21	5.85	4.38	7.80
4. Number of subordinate constructions	.17	.22	.00	.17

Table 9

Measurements of Oral and Written Language: Grade Three

Oral Sample

	Project Schools		Comparison Schools	
	Pre test	Post test	Pre test	Post test
1. Total number of words	108.78	67.00	47.90	79.90
2. Number of C-units	10.56	7.00	4.80	7.30
3. Number of mazes	3.33	2.00	1.70	3.00
4. Total number of words in C-units	99.00	55.44	43.30	63.50
5. Total number of words in mazes	9.78	4.89	4.50	16.30
6. Number of subordinate constructions	.67	.22	.50	.70
7. Average length of C-units	8.37	8.94	8.77	7.86

Written Sample

1. Number of words	22.07	28.14	34.07	41.71
2. Number of C-units	2.14	3.07	3.64	5.00
3. Average length of C-units	7.74	7.83	8.06	8.44
4. Number of subordinate constructions	.07	.29	.43	.57

Table 10

Measurements of Oral and Written Language: Grade Four

Oral Sample

		Project Schools		Comparison Schools	
		Pre test	Post test	Pre test	Post test
1.	Total number of words	99.96	80.71	113.69	120.38
2.	Number of C-units	10.58	8.83	12.19	13.69
3.	Number of mazes	3.22	2.65	3.19	3.75
4.	Total number of words in C-Units	90.63	73.04	104.94	110.94
5.	Total number of words in mazes	10.04	7.74	8.75	9.38
* 6.	Number of subordinate constructions	1.75	1.38	1.88	1.25
* 7.	Average length of C-units	8.61	8.55	8.96	8.18

Written Sample

1.	Number of words	47.44	47.44	50.94	54.06
2.	Number of C-units	5.12	5.08	5.69	6.00
3.	Average length of C-units	8.46	7.90	9.59	9.93
4.	Number of subordinate constructions	.68	.84	.81	.38

Inferences from the data are extremely limited because the comparability of the groups is not known, the timing of the pre-test came after many of the training activities had been used in the project schools, and many more variables than those under the control of the project were operating in both project and comparison schools. However, the following statements can be made:

In the oral language samples in grades one through four, the comparison schools began lower and made greater gains over the period between pre and post tests. Project schools, on final standing showed slight, though not significant ($p > .05$) superiority on only one measure of language development, average length of communication units.

In the written sample, comparison schools began higher and made the greatest gains over the period between pre and post tests. Only in grades two and four in the number of subordinate constructions did the project schools show slight superiority.

Measurements of children's reading achievement in project and comparison schools were obtained from the public schools annual testing program. Only very limited data were available. The following information is abstracted from the Northwest Regional Laboratory's final report, Appendix C.

No clearcut indication of the program's effectiveness can be inferred from the data available. Data were available from only two of the project schools and the two comparison schools from the third grade classroomsonly, at the end of the first year. There is no way of knowing the initial standing of the children or the comparability of the populations. The data available are presented in Table 11.

Table 11

Reading Achievement Test* Results for Project and Comparison Schools

School		N	Mean	SD
Project -	School 1	31	25.87	6.93
	School 2	63	21.48	7.85
Comparison	School 3	69	24.91	7.95
	School 4	69	25.17	8.12

* McMenemy Reading Test - Spring 1971

Data for the project schools were combined and compared to the data from the combined comparison schools. A t-test for independent groups showed that the reading achievement of the comparison schools was significantly superior ($p > .05$) to that of project schools.

4. Participants' Perceptions of Program Activities.

   a. Parents and Teachers' Evaluation of the Program.

Questionnaires requesting participants' evaluation of program activities were distributed during and after the program's first year. At mid-year teachers and parents were asked to rate the effectiveness of the presentations and the usefulness of each of the lecture-discussion and workshop activities. Mean ratings on a seven point scale from 1, low to 7, high were obtained and are presented in Table 12.

Table 12

Participants' Ratings of Program Activities

	Lecture-Discussions		Workshop Sessions	
	Presentation	Usefulness	Presentation	Usefulness
Parents	5.4	3.8	6.0	5.9
Teachers	5.0	5.1	5.2	4.9

At the end of the year, the topics reported by teachers to be of the greatest value were:

1. Elements of a Reading Lesson
2. Teaching Word-Recognition
3. Comparisons of Approaches to Teaching Reading
4. Relationship Between Reading and Creative Writing
5. Informal Reading Inventory
6. Teacher-made and Published Diagnostic Tests
7. Questioning Strategies
8. Reading Stories to Children
9. Using Literature Packets
10. Establishing and Managing Classroom Libraries

Teachers were asked to rate the value of assignments on a five point scale from 1,of little value to 5, very valuable. The lowest mean value reported was 2.9 (report on sequences of lessons); the highest mean value reported was 4.1 (establish a classroom library). The overall mean for all assignments was 3.5.

Teachers reported that supervisors assisted primarily by teaching small groups, by supplying teaching suggestions and materials, by observing and by working with individual children. Twenty two teachers gave ratings of excellent to the supervisory activities. 3 teachers reported occasions when supervisory activities were inconvenient.

Free responses indicated that the policy of help being offered at teacher's convenience rather than being forced upon teachers or offered according to a schedule was considerably valued. Teachers reported greater confidence and improved technique in many specific classroom situations in which they were individually assisted by supervisors but which recieved no formal observation or evaluation.

Twenty three teachers had the same substitute teacher each week, nine had the same substitute most weeks, Twenty nine teachers still found it necessary to prepare a full day's work for the substitute on most occasions. Two teachers rated their substitutes as poor, three rated them as fair, thirteen rated them as good, and fourteen rated them outstanding. Seventeen teachers reported that the use of substitute teachers caused no problems, three reported that substitutes had difficulties controlling the class, and six reported some difficulties in preparing suitable lessons for the substitutes to teach. Six teachers reported that their classes had not accomplished as much as in previous years and three reported poorer quality work from the classes compared with previous years.

In general, wherever the school made an effort to obtain the same substitute each week, to acquaint that substitute with what was expected of him, the teachers reported that their substitutes performed very well.

All of the teachers except one indicated that they studied for the post-tests each quarter. Twenty of them found the study relevant to their work in the classroom, eight did not, and six were undecided. All but one of the teachers found the statements of behavioral objectives to be useful.

Summaries of free responses indicated that teachers were generally in favor of program activities continuing in the same format, that lecture-discussion sessions were useful but too long, test-emphasis was too great, and that more time should be given to working with teachers individually in the classrooms.

Questionnaires were sent by mail to nineteen parents three months after the program ended. Fourteen replies were received. Eight parents indicated that they gave between one and two hours time to the school each week, six indicated that they gave more than two hours. Helping individual children with reading and language was by far the most frequently reported form of assistance. All fourteen parents reported that in their opinion the school valued their help. In answer to the question, "Were you asked at any time to do anything you could not do?", all fourteen replied, no. Twelve reported that the program had shown them definite ways in which to help a teacher in school; one reported that she had tutored previously and had learned nothing new. One felt that she should be told exactly what to do when helping a certain child and that decisions should not be left to her. Thirteen parents expressed a willingness and the likelihood of continuing to help in some way.

Twelve reported that they had learned how to help their own children. All fourteen reported that they had gained a better understanding of the schools' reading programs. Four reported giving out of school help to other parents and children.

In general, the parents valued their own workshop sessions very highly, but found the general lecture-discussions to be too often unrelated to their immediate needs and therefore less valuable. Many indicated a desire to know more specifically at the beginning of the program what was expected of them. Almost all indicated that exchange of information on the specific problems they were encountering was one of the most valuable activities. Almost all also indicated a strong desire for some supervision and individual evaluation of their work.

b. Teachers' Attitudes and Practices

A Teacher Attitudes and Practice Survey Questionnaire was designed by Specialized Educational Consultant Services, Incorporated, North Carolina, and administered in October, four months after the commencement of the program and in May, at the close of the first year. No measures were taken before the program commenced. The survey contained three scales: 1) attitudes towards general school practices; 2) frequency of use of various teaching techniques; 3) attitudes toward parent involvement and non-standard dialects. Differences between the October and May surveys were found not to be statistically significant. Attitudes towards general school

practices, frequency of use of recommended teaching methods, and attitudes towards parent involvement and non-standard dialects appear to have remained stable throughout the period between the surveys. Data are given in Table 13.

Table 13

Raw Score Means of Teacher Attitude and Practices Survey

	October Survey	May Survey
Scale 1	184.00	180.96
Scale 2	177.54	182.04
Scale 3	126.32	128.54

E. Multiplier Effect

In addition to its work within the four program schools, the program has also had effects upon the broader community. The extent of such effects is extremely difficult to assess. No one can measure for example the effect of the program upon improving university and public school relations. However, evidence of two major effects is available.

1. Within the university, over twenty sets of instructional handouts ranging from simple informative leaflets to complex training sequences have been made available to and used in methods courses within the School of Education.
2. Requests have been made to the university for EPDA Program staff members to assist voluntarily in other in-service training programs, and to act as consultants to other schools. They have assisted in the following ways:
   a) Conducted two training sessions of a local workshop for teacher aides.
   b) Spoken to two school P.T.A. meetings
   c) Made a presentation at the Annual Conference of I.R.A.
   d) Conducted two workshops and given three lectures to local professional groups, I.R.A., and N.C.T.E.
   e) Presented lecture-discussion sessions to two class sessions of university methods courses.

Three other requests for intensive in-service courses were received and had to be deferred until the program was complete.

F. Findings

The Portland Project provided one day per week of released time to teachers of grades one through four of four low achieving, disadvantaged, public elementary schools. It included principals, teachers, teacher aides, and a group of parents within the scope of its program. It combined university classroom presentation workshop activities, and independent assignments with on site demonstration and supervision. Specifically it showed that teachers', aides', and parents' knowledge of techniques of teaching reading could be substantially increased; that improvements in certain features of teachers' classroom performance could be brought about; and that parents could assist teachers in many ways, perceive themselves as valued assistants, and be perceived as such by teachers.

It further demonstrated that personnel from a large public school system, an urban university, and a regional educational laboratory can work together harmoniously and effectively as an in-service training and evaluation team.

The following conclusions can be drawn in relation to the objectives of the program:

1. The program brought about significant improvements in teachers' knowledge of materials and techniques for teaching reading.
2. Teachers demonstrated competence in the use of several major diagnostic techniques. The program also brought

about significant improvements in certain aspects of teaching performance of the group as a whole, notably in planning each week's work to include a variety of appropriate materials and classroom organizational patterns, in involving children in planning classroom activities, in holding individual conferences with children, in planning independent work activities for children, in making use of a systematic plan when teaching reading to small groups of children, and in establishing and maintaining classroom libraries.

3. A ten-morning summer workshop in basic techniques in teaching reading increased teacher aides' techniques for teaching reading and ways of working with children. It enabled them to assist more effectively in their classrooms.
4. Parents trained in basic techniques of teaching reading and the use of materials were able to assist teachers with individuals and small groups in their classrooms.

The following observations may also be made:

1. Teachers in four low-achieving schools initially did not perform well on tests of knowledge of everyday materials and techniques for teaching reading and language.

2. Throughout the year the esprit de corps of program participants and their attitudes towards implementing program suggestions remained uniformly high. This is probably attributable to the sufficient amounts of time provided, the practical emphasis of the training activities, and the balance of off-site and on-site training activities.

3. Public school supervisory staff and university staff members played complementary roles, extended each others experiences, and benefitted by collaborating for a common purpose.

4. Though adequate measures were not available, it appears unlikely that children made significant gains or losses in reading or language achievements during the period in which teachers were released from school one day a week to receive training.

5. Teachers of grades one through four were released from school one day a week, and substitute teachers took their places without major disruptions of school functioning and without adverse effects upon children's achievement.

It was apparent to the program staff from teachers' performances on pre-tests and from informal comments made as rapport was established between

program participants and staff, that many teachers teach daily in their classrooms with limited knowledge of the range of alternative teaching techniques and materials available to them, and at times with insufficient confidence and information to ask questions, show initiative in program changes, set appropriate goals, or seek out new ways of achieving their goals. For many teachers, systematic in-service training appears to be a necessity if they are to increase the effectiveness, the scope, and the interest of their classroom programs.

Staff members from both the university and the public school system with experience of other in-service programs attribute many of the successes of the Portland Project to these factors:

1. The released time which gave the teachers the time and opportunity they needed to examine their goals and explore teaching alternatives, and gave the program staff the opportunity to require teachers to perform certain training tasks.
2. The objectivity, perspective, and expertise provided by the university staff, which gave direction to and extended the experience of the public school staff.
3. The sufficiency of the time allowed to classroom supervisors which allowed them to make frequent visits to program classrooms and work closely and intensively with the teachers.

A major failing which did not become apparent until the end of the program was the insufficient insistence by program staff upon the practice and mastery of discrete teaching skills by the program participants. For example, such skills as the giving of directions to a class, the teaching of a sound-symbol relationship, and the pacing

of a discussion, were all discussed and understood and were used by teachers in classrooms. The program did not provide sufficient opportunities for the mastery of those skills in practice situations for those teachers who needed them.

One of the major problems of an eclectic program appears to be that in the hands of some teachers, at least at a certain stage in their development, it tends to become a piecemeal program rather than an integrated, diagnostically based program. Perhaps detailed case studies of the development of diagnostic teaching techniques by individual teachers are needed to throw light upon this problem and suggest appropriate training measures.

The problem of evaluating diagnostic teaching is extremely complex and was encountered but not solved during this project. The use of a single observational schedule implies an expectation of one kind of teaching performance for all teachers. While appropriate for use with some teachers at certain stages of development, it is bound to be inappropriate for use with other highly imaginative and effective teachers. One solution appears to be individual evaluations of teaching performance by sophisticated observers aware of individual goals. This solution occurred to the program staff too late to be put to use in the Portland Project.

V Recommendations

The Portland Project was innovative rather than exemplary. Because of its exploratory nature, the need for cooperation with other projects in distant parts of the country, and the need for a comprehensive evaluation of its activities, its operating budget was large, far larger than would be needed by a school district to replicate its most successful features with a similar population. Furthermore, inadequacies in the training model and its evaluation design appeared before the program was complete. Perhaps though, as much can be learned from the project's shortcomings, as from its successes. With these points in mind the following recommendations are made concerning in-service programs in the teaching of reading.

1. An in-service training program is well advised to provide generous time allowances for the participants to assimilate new information and engage in training tasks.
2. Leadership and the planning and staffing of program activities is more likely to be innovative, objective, and comprehensive when it is a responsibility shared between knowledgeable persons from within the public school system and specialists from the university.
3. Leadership is the responsibility of the program staff. Though it is desirable to include program participants in the planning, they may not be in a position to do so until they have experienced many of the training activities and grasped the possible scope of

the program.

4. It does not appear to be sufficient merely to identify discrete teaching skills, discuss them, and observe them in use in classrooms. The findings of this program suggest that opportunities for practice and mastery of discrete teaching skills before they are applied in the classroom are necessary for many teachers.
5. It seems to be advantageous for all staff members to be prepared to carry out all staff roles: presentation of information, direction of workshop activities, on-site supervision and demonstration. This keeps all staff members in touch with the problems of application and transfer.
6. Principals, teachers, aides, and parents can all benefit from inclusion in the program. All need systematic feedback.
7. A program should include process goals as well as product goals. Not all of the activities of a program will result in objective measurable changes of behavior occurring with the duration of the program.
8. The goals of a program of supervision need to be regarded as specific goals for individual teachers and evaluated accordingly, not as group goals for all teachers.
9. A program should remain responsive to emerging needs. Not all program goals can be anticipated ahead of time.
10. The comparative effectiveness of various styles of classroom supervision needs to be investigated.

List of References

Aaron, Ira E., Callaway, B., and Olson A.V. Conducting In-Service Programs in Reading, Newark, Deleware: International Reading Association, 1965.

Austin, Mary C., Morrison, Coleman,and others, The First R: The Harvard Report on Reading in the Elementary Schools. New York: Macmillan, 1963.

Bond, Guy L., and Dykstra, Robert. The Cooperative Research Program in First Grade Reading Instruction. Reading Research Quarterly, Vol. II, no. 4, (Summer, 1967), 5-142.

Della-Piana, G. and Others. "Parents and Reading Achievement." Elementary English, Vol. 45, February, 1968.

Emmerling, Frank C., and Chavis, Kanawha Z., "Innovations in Education", 'The Teacher Aide'," Educational Leadership, XXIV (November, 1966), pp. 175-183.

Loban, Walter. The Language of Elementary School Children, Champaign, Illinois, National Council of Teachers of English, 1963.

Smith, Mildred B. and Brahce, Carl. "When School and Home Focus on Achievement". Educational Leadership 20 (February,1963), pp. 314-318.

Smith, Mildred B., "School and Home: Focus on Achievement." In Developing Programs for the Educationally Disadvantaged. edited by A. Harry Passow, pp. 87-107, New York, Teachers College Press, Columbia University, 1968.

Spache, George D. and Spache, Evelyn B., Reading in the Elementary School. Second Edition, Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1969.

Appendix A

Topics and Training Activities of the Portland Project

Summer - 1970, Basic Techniques in Teaching Reading

A. Lecture-Discussions

1. The Total Reading Program. Old and new definitions of reading. Short and long-term goals of school reading programs. Developmental, practice, corrective, remedial, and readiness aspects of a reading program.
2. Basal Readers. Comparison between conventional basal readers and recent alternatives. Rationale, limitations, and intended use.
3. A Conventional Reading Lesson. Essential elements of a reading lesson. A reading lesson as a problem-solving activity. Classroom tested suggestions.
4. Word-Recognition Skills. An examination of theory and practice of the most widely recommended techniques for teaching independence in recognizing words.
5. Planning a Week's Reading Instruction. A classroom organizational plan permitting systematic group teaching, individualized independent reading, and regular individualized corrective assistance.
6. The Language Experience Approach. The relationship between reading and children's language. Ways of using children's spontaneous personal language to teach children how to read.
7. Teacher-Made Media. The construction and use of photographs, film strips, film clips, and audio tapes in the teaching of reading.
8. Phonics Approaches. The sound-spelling relationships of English words expressed as phonic generalizations. Cautions, limitations,

and general principles for using this information for teaching.

9. Linguistics Approaches. Recent terms from linguistics. The use of spelling patterns and sentence patterns in the teaching of reading limitations.
10. Teaching Reading Comprehension. Conventional analyses of reading comprehension. Teaching comprehension.

B. Workshop Activities

1. Preview of audio-tapes for teaching listening.
2. Construction of audio-tapes for language and listening activities.
3. Preview of films for use in teaching language arts.
4. Using films to teach language arts.
5. Examination - demonstration of selected reading readiness programs and materials.

C. Specific Independent Assignments

1. Examine materials and compare two different approaches to the teaching of reading.
2. Locate, describe, critique, and where necessary - outline, plans for supplementing the word-recognition program of the materials you intend to use for teaching reading this year.
3. Develop your plans for your first week's teaching of reading and language arts.
4. Keep a log of independent readings and your reactions to them.

Fall 1971

The Relationships Between the Teaching of Reading and the Teaching of Language

A. Lecture-Discussions

1. Listening and Speaking. Relationships among the language arts classroom activities for developing listening and speaking.
2. Improving Listening and Speaking. Fluency and precision in speech. Activities for improving listening and speaking.
3. Creative Dramatics. The use of informal dramatic activities in elementary school language arts.
4. Written Composition. Stimulating written composition, encouraging fluency.
5. Improving Written Composition. Activities for sustaining and improving children's writing.
6. Dialect, Usage and Grammar in the Classroom. Descriptive versus prescriptive approaches to language study. Implications for teachers.
7. Language Development in Young Children. Summaries of recent investigations in children's acquisition of language. Implications for teachers.
8. Reading Aloud to Children. Choosing books and reading aloud to children.
9. Oral Reading and Choral Reading Activities. Guidelines for oral reading. Choosing passages for choral reading. Teaching choral reading.
10. Poetry in the Elementary Classroom. Choosing poems for children. Activities which encourage children to read and write poems.
11. Evaluating Children's Development in Listening, Speaking and Writing. Informal and formal ways of assessing children's development. Implications for teaching.

B. Workshop Activities

1. Methods and materials for teaching the alphabet.
2. Writing behavioral objectives for reading and language.
3. Activities in creative dramatics - participation.
4. Teaching handwriting - participation and application of diagnostic techniques.
5. Constructing and using a classroom writing center.
6. Using catalogs and curriculum guides to obtain materials.
7. Using a tape recorder for oral reading activities.
8. Making audio-tapes for language lessons.

C. Specific Independent Assignments

Select one topic in the language arts. Describe the children's backgrounds and write objectives for a sequence of lessons or activities over a period of four or five weeks. Carry out the activities. After each one, analyze what happened and modify your plans towards meeting the objectives.

Winter 1970-71

Diagnosing Individual Students Needs In Learning To Read

A. Lecture-Discussions

1. When Should Reading Instruction Begin? A review of studies of early readers. Assessing reading readiness.
2. Activities Before a Child Learns to Read. A discussion of pre-reading activities and their purposes.

3. Questioning Strategies in the Classroom. Kinds of questions. Developing questions for specific purposes.
4. Informal Reading Inventories. The purposes, construction, and limitations of informal reading inventories.
5. A Language Program in a Ghetto School. Guest Speaker - Mr. E. Gottlieb.
6. Correcting Selected Word-Recognition Difficulties.
7. Verbal and Non-Verbal Communication. Guest Speaker - Dr. S. Jones.
8. Teaching Children to Read Textbooks. Guest Speaker - Dr. Margaret Early
9. Classroom Organization. Strengths and weaknesses of various grouping and individualized procedures.
10. Correcting Selected Comprehension Difficulties. Ways of identifying comprehension problems. Corrective methods and materials.

B. Workshop Activities

1. Tests of Auditory Discrimination
2. Tests of Learning Methods and Learning Rate.
3. Tests of Sight Vocabulary
4. Teacher-made Diagnostic Reading Tests
5. Informal Reading Inventory Proficiency Test - Administration, Recording, and Interpretation.
6. Independent Activities for Teaching Reading.
7. Estimating Reading Potential.
8. Estimating the Difficulty of Reading Materials.

C. Specific Independent Assignments

1. Administer and interpret each of the following tests:

   Wepman Auditory Discrimination Test

Durrell Learning Rate Test

Harris or Mills Learning Methods Test

Two Informal Reading Inventories

Dolch or Fry List of Basic Words

Roswell Chall Diagnostic Reading Test

2. Compute reading expectancies for two members of your class.
3. Contribute materials for independent activities designed to teach specific reading skills.
4. Write questions about reading passages to use with a class to accomplish appropriately stated objectives.
5. Compute the readability of two selected children's library books.

Spring 1970-71

Children's Literature and the Teaching of Reading

A. Lecture-Discussions

1. Reading Aloud to Children. Guest Speaker - Dr. Vera Petersen.
2. Sharing Independent Reading. Using various media for interpreting and sharing children's books.
3. A Literature Curriculum. Guidelines for literature curriculum. Teacher's role in selecting literature.
4. Illustrations in Children's Books. Guest Speaker - Dr. Vera Petersen.
5. Intermediate Literature Packets. Obtaining, preparing and using sets of good books.
6. Story Ladies. An active role for parents in a school reading program.

7. Classroom Libraries. Establishing a classroom library. Good Management Practices.
8. Children's Independent Reading. Findings and Problems.
9. Reference Books for Children. Guest Speaker - Dr. Vera Petersen
10. Using Radio and Television to Teach Reading and Literature.

B. Workshop Activities

1. Grade level group discussions of ways of sharing children's books.
2. Grade level group discussions of using children's literature for teaching reading.
3. Discussion of major difficulties teachers face in implementing program suggestions.
4. Visit to a school library.

C. Specific Independent Assignments

1. Establish a classroom library according to program guidelines and management practices.
2. Collect information by means of an informal reading inventory technique about children's performance in word-recognition and comprehension in books they have chosen for independent reading.
3. Prepare stories for reading aloud.
4. Prepare stories from children's literature for use in the reading program.

Appendix B

Observations of Teachers' Classroom Performances

A. 1. How do you organize your class for reading instruction? (If teacher groups children, then ask.) How are children grouped?

2. Observer will record organizational pattern of class during at least two language arts writing or reading lesson periods.

B. The observer will be asked to detect the presence or absence of the following sequence of steps in reading lessons.

*I. 1. Motive (The Content) Was the topic, title, a division of the reading or an illustration in the book discussed before the main reading began?

2. Background (Material Extraneous to Story Content) Was background information relevant to the story content presented or reviewed before the main reading began?

3. Vocabulary Was vocabulary presented visually and meanings discussed before the main reading began?

4. Guidance Did the teacher indicate the amount of reading to be done and the manner in which it was to be done?

a. Before the main reading began?

b. Did the teacher indicate an implicit beginning point?

c. Did the teacher indicate explicitly the amount to be read?

d. Did the teacher indicate the rate at which the selection was to be read?

5. Purpose Were specific purpose setting questions asked before the main reading began?

* Items 1-5 may appear in any order.

II. 6. Reading (For Purpose of Discussion)

Did the children read the first passage silently before the discussion took place?

III. 7. Re-reading

a. Was oral re-reading conducted in response to the specific purpose setting questions?

b. Did the reading approximate natural speech rather than word-by-word or sing-song before it was accepted by the teacher?

c. Did the discussion attempt to relate the story content to the children's background?

IV. 8. Skills Practice

a. Was an assignment given using material other than that in the reading passage?

b. Were directions about how to do it given clearly?

c. Were some examples worked out and discussed prior to independent work?

9. Transfer (Material not Regularly in Content)

Were suggestions made for further activities of reading related to the lesson?

The anticipated sequence I-IV may not be completed for observation in one typical reading period.

C. Observers will record the presence or absence of each of the following types of questions:

i. Cognitive-Factual
ii. Convergent
iii. Divergent
iv. Evaluative

D. Observers will record the sequence of the above questions.

E. Observer will record systematically samples of the behavior of the children not under the direct supervision of teacher.

F. Observer will look for the presence or absence of the following items and events:

(A.) Books in Classroom Library

1. Non-Fiction Books

a. Alphabet Books

b. Number and Counting Books

c. Books on Science and Social Studies

(1) Biographies

(2) Travel Stories

(3) True Adventures

(4) True Animal Stories

(5) Science Topics

(6) Social Studies Topics

(7) Science Reference Books

2. Fiction Books

a. Fairy Tales

(1) Old

(2) New

b. Folk Tales

(1) Old

(2) New

(3) American

(4) Other Lands

c. Picture Books

d. Poetry

(1) Mother Goose

(2) Nonsense Rhymes

(3) Old

(4) New

e. Animal Stories

f. Adventure Stories

g. Sports Stories

h. Mysteries

i. Plays and Choral Reading for Children

3. Magazines

a. Jack and Jill

b. Highlights

c. Weekly Reader

d. Boys Life

e. Humpty Dumpty

f. Children's Digest

g. Junior Natural History

(B). Appearance of the Classroom Library

1. Rug

2. Comfortable chairs (Rocking chairs, chairs different from those of the classroom)

3. Posters about books or reading

4. A book display

5. Book jackets

6. Puppets

(C). Use of the Library

1. Children are using the library

2. A child can point out something new in the library this week.

3. Children assist in the arrangement of books.

4. Records of books read are available.

5. Recommendations about books are made orally or in writing.

6. The teacher helps a child find a book.

7. The teacher helps a child read a book.

Appendix C

Teachers' Log of Parents' Assistance

DATE:_____

NAME:_____

SCHOOL:_____

GRADE YOU TEACH:_____

1. During the past week did you have a parent helping you in the classroom?

___yes ___no

If yes, how many?_____

PLEASE LIST RESPONSES TO THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS IN THE LOG BELOW

2. What specific tasks did the parent(s) perform?
3. How much time did the parent(s) spend on each task?
4. How much time did it cost you to have the parent(s) help on each task?
5. How much time did it save you to have the parent(s) help on each task?

Specific Task	Estimated Total Time for Each Task	Time Cost to You	Time Saved for You

Appendix D

Teachers' Evaluation of First Year Training Activities

(Please do not write names on these sheets, but do please indicate the grade level you teach)

1. Topics

Looking back over last year's topics, please recall as many as you can. Against each rate its value to you as a teacher from 1 (no value) to 5 (very valuable). This refers to all program activities at PSU, general sessions, workshops, guest speakers, etc. Exact titles are not important. Placement in the right quarter is helpful but not important.

TOPICS	RATING 1(no value) - 5 (very valuable)
SUMMER	
FALL	
WINTER	
SPRING	

2. Assignments

You were asked to complete many assignments. Against each assignment listed below, please rate its value to you in learning something useful to a classroom teacher.

Assignments	Rating 1(no value)-5(very valuable)
Summer	
a. Compare Two Approaches to the Teaching of REading.	
b. Describe and Critique the Word-Recognition Program at One Level of S.R.A.	
c. Develop a Plan for Your First Week's Teaching.	
d. Keep a Log of Summer Readings and Your Reactions to Them.	
Fall	
a. Report on a Sequence of Lessons, part 1.	
b. Report on a Sequence of Lessons, part 2.	
Winter	
a. Administer and Interpret a Wepman Auditory Discrimination Test.	
b. Administer and Interpret a Durrell Learning Rate Test	
c. Administer and Interpret a Learning Methods Test	
d. Administer and Interpret an Informal Reading Inventory.	
e. Administer and Interpret a Roswell Chall Diagnostic Reading Test.	
f. Compute Reading Expectancies for Two Children.	
g. Submit a Suggestion for an Independent Activity.	

Assignments	Rating 1(no value)-5(very valuable)
h. Write and Use a Sequence of Questions About a Reading Passage.	
i. Compute the Readability of Two Library Books.	
Spring	
a. Establish a Classroom Library.	
b. Keep a Log of Books for Children You Have Read.	
c. Keep a Log of Books You have Read Aloud to Children.	
d. Report on Teaching a Lesson from Sounds of Language.	
e. Report on WAys of Having Children Share Books.	
f. Report on Using a Literature Packet.	
g. Report on a Child's Performance in Independent Reading (I.R.I. Techniques)	

ADD COMMENTS IF YOU WISH

3. Supervision

   a. What did EPDA supervisors do in your classrooms?

   b. Please comment on the value of help given by supervisors.

   c. Were any of the supervisory activities unnecessary or inconvenient?

      ____No ____ Yes, please explain

      comment if you wish

   d. In what ways can a supervisor help you most?

4. Substitute Teachers

a. Did a substitute teacher take your place each week?

____Yes ____No

b. Did you have the same substitute?

____Always ____Almost Always ____Occasionally ____Never

c. Did you still have to prepare work all year long?

____Yes ____No Comment if you wish.

d. How would you rate your substitute's performance?

____Poor ____Fair ____Good ____Outstanding

e. Was there anything she did particularly well?

f. Was there anything that caused you problems or extra work?

g. Compared with previous years, did you time away from the classroom cut down on the amount or quality of work you could accomplish?

Amount?

Quality?

What kinds of work? subject, etc.?

5. Tests

a. In general, were the test questions relevant to your work in the classroom? ___Yes ___No

b. Did you study for the tests? ___Yes ___No

c. If so, was the time spent on studying -

____ Time Wasted ____ Time Well Spent

Comment if you wish

d. Were the lists of objectives helpful? ____No ____Yes

Comment if you wish

6. Textbooks

a. Did you make use of texts brought to your attention by EPDA?

Please list:

b. How helpful was the bibliography?

____Very helpful ____Helpful

____Of little help ____Of no help

7. Materials

Please list teaching materials that you tried or made use of that were brought to your attention primarily by EPDA. Comment on their value if you wish.

8. Overall Evaluation

a. In what ways, if any, has the EPDA program made you a more effective teacher?

b. What do you think the EPDA program stressed?

c. What suggestions would you make for the coming year?

Appendix E

Questionnaire for Parents

Please do not write your names on this questionnaire.

1. About how much time per week were you able to spend in school helping a teacher?

   A. Before Christmas

	Between Christmas and Spring	After Spring
____None	____	____
____Less than one hour	____	____
____From one to two hours	____	____
____More than two hours	____	____

   B. What kinds of things did you do? Please list.

2. Were you asked at any time to do anything you could not do?

   ___No ___Yes. If yes, explain.

3. In your opinion, did the school value your help?

   ___Yes ___No: Comment if you wish

4. Did you feel that the EPDA program showed you definite ways in which you could help a teacher in school?

   ____Yes ____No: Comment if you wish

5. Are you likely to continue to help in some way?

   ____Yes ____No: Comment if you wish

6. Did EPDA show you definite ways you could help your own children learn to read?

____Yes ____No: Comment if you wish

7. Has EPDA given you a better understanding of your school's reading program?

____Yes ____No: Comment if you wish

8. Has EPDA helped you describe and explain your school's reading program to other parents?

____Yes ____No: Comment if you wish

9. Have you given any out of school help to other parents or other children?

____No ____Yes: If yes, please describe briefly.

10. What was most valuable to you?

11. What was least valuable to you?

12. Was it a good idea to include parents and teachers in the same sessions much of the time?

____Yes ____No: Comment if you wish.

13. What suggestions would you make to improve the program for parents next time?